

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings have been objected to for various reasons. These objections have been addressed in the following manner:

Paragraph 2, a through f: The following drawings have been amended to use consistent reference numbers: FIGs 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

Paragraph 3: Reference number 602 added to FIG. 6.

Paragraph 4: The reference numbers 202, 306, 502 and 506 have been removed from the figures (see amendments made in reference to addressing the objections pertaining to paragraph 2, a through f).

Therefore, with the entry of these amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the objection be withdrawn and that the drawings be approved.

REMARKS

Claims 1-52 are pending. Claims 1-52 have been rejected. Claims 1, 14, 27 and 40 have been amended.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 14-16, 18-20, 27-29, 31-33, 40-42 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being allegedly anticipated by Hung (Pub No. US 2002/0087584). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the present claim amendment renders the present rejection moot.

Claim 1 of the Applicants' claimed invention has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein if more than one portion of a same document is identified, the same document can be transferred into more than one folder associated with particular identified portions of the document and if no relevant folder exists to accept the identified portion of the document, a new folder will be created."

Hung discloses a method and system for managing messages. A machine may present the message to a user and allow a user to select one or more values from the message, to be used as a filter for a folder.

An examination of the claims of Hung indicates that messages are stored in a **folder** (not a plurality of folders). For example, claim 1 of Hung states "(ii) creating a folder", claim 2 states "after creating a folder." The remaining claims of Hung are also directed towards a singular folder.

Hung fails to teach or suggest at least the feature of allowing a user to select one or more values from the message and transferring it into **more than one folder**.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 14, 27 and 40 are independent claims that recite related subject matter to claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding claim 1 as well as the additionally recited features found in these claims.

Claims 2-3, 5-7, 15-16, 18-20, 28-29, 31-33, 41-42, 44-46 are dependent claims that depend upon their respective independent claims and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above regarding the independent claims as well as the additionally recited features found in these claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 17, 30 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hung and Clark et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,725,228). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the present claim amendment renders the present rejection moot.

Claims 4, 17, 30 and 43 are dependent claims that depend upon respective independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 40 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above emphasizing the deficiencies of the primary reference Hung.

It is respectfully submitted that the secondary reference, Clark et al. fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference Hung noted above. Also, it appears that neither Clark et al. nor Hung teaches that “if no relevant folder exists to accept the identified portion of the document, a new folder will be created.”

Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn and that claims 4, 17, 30 and 43 be allowed.

Claims 8-9, 21-22, 34-35, and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hung and Internet Explorer 5 as taught by Freeze (1999).

It is respectfully submitted that the present claim amendment renders the present rejection moot.

Claims 8-9, 21-22, 34-35, and 47-48 are dependent claims that depend upon respective independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 40 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above emphasizing the deficiencies of the applied references.

It is respectfully submitted that the applied secondary and tertiary references fail to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference Hung noted above. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn and that claims 8-9, 21-22, 34-35, and 47-48 be allowed.

Claims 10-13, 23-26, 36-39 and 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hung, Clark et al. and Internet Explorer 5, as taught by Freeze (1999). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that the present claim amendment renders the present rejection moot.

Claims 10-13, 23-26, 36-39 and 49-52 are dependent claims that depend upon respective independent claims 1, 14, 27 and 40 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons presented above emphasizing the deficiencies of the primary reference Hung.

It is respectfully submitted that the secondary and tertiary references fail to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference Hung noted above. Therefore, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection be withdrawn and that claims 10-13, 23-26, 36-39 and 49-52 be allowed.

CONCLUSION


In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 27, 2006

By:


John L. Ciccozzi
Reg. No. 48,984
(858) 845-2611

QUALCOMM Incorporated
Attn: Patent Department
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-1714
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

Annotated Sheet





FIG. 2

Annotated Sheet



BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FIG. 3

Annotated Sheet




FIG. 4

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Annotated Sheet

Mail Application Window:

- Toolbar:** NEW Message, Open Folder, Invite..., ESP Groups, U.
- Search Bar:** Who, Date, Subject.
- Message List:**
 - WEudor Bill Ganon 4/3/03 1 More new icons
 - WEudor Bill Ganon 4/21/03 1 add <workgroup>
 - WEudor Bill Ganon 4/21/03 1 add <workgroup>
 - WEudor Bill Ganon 4/21/03 1 add <workgroup>
 - WEudor Bill Ganon 4/21/03 1 Final 6.0 icons
 - Essenti: John Noerenberg 4/22/03 1 Re: Final 6.0 icons
 - WEudor Greg Brown 4/22/03 1 Re: Final 6.0 icons
 - John D. Boyd 4/30/03 1 Re: IMAP & SpamWatch**
 - Essenti: Steve Dorner 4/30/03 1 Re: IMAP & SpamWatch
 - WEudor Dale R. Wiggins 4/30/03 1 Re: IMAP & SpamWatch
 - WEudor Dale R. Wiggins 4/30/03 1 Re: IMAP & SpamWatch
 - Essenti: Pete Resnick 5/1/03 2 Re: IMAP & SpamWatch
 - Essenti: John D. Boyd 5/1/03 2 Re: IMAP & SpamWatch
- File Size:** 214/624K/127K
- Message Headers:**

To: John D. Boyd <jdboyd@qualcomm.com>
 From: Steve Dorner <sdorner@qualcomm.com>
 Subject: Re: IMAP & SpamWatch
 Cc: Eudora-Design-1808St-Workgroup: Alan Bird <abird@qualcomm.com>,
 ...snip... mac-eudora-dv@qualcomm.com
- Text:** <>-flowed>At 2:59 PM -0700 4/30/03, John D. Boyd wrote:
 >Any ideas, thoughts?
- Note:** Even with UIDPLUS we may have issues if we access the mail from more than one location.
- Sidebar:**
 - pmf (102)
 - Flagg2 (502)
 - Inbox
 - Cornell
 - International Test Cases
 - Others
 - SpamWatch (508)
 - Tech
 - testuser@resnick1 (520)
 - Inbox
 - IMAP
 - old-intl-problems
 - Spotlight
 - temp
 - test
 - Trash

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FIG. 5




FIG. 6